



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,791	10/12/2001	Takanobu Kai	NECM 19.067	9579

26304 7590 09/03/2003

KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN
575 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585

EXAMINER

NGO, HUNG V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2831

DATE MAILED: 09/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/975,791

Applicant(s)
Kai

Examiner
Hung V. Ngo

Art Unit
2831



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 23, 2003
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2831

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 3, 10, 12, 15, 18, line 5, "the emi shield member does not include sidewalls along a perimeter of the emi shield member" is not discussed in the specification. Any negative limitation or exclusionary proviso must have basis in the original disclosure See Ex parte Grasselli, 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App. 1983)(MPEP 2173.05(i)). This limitation is not considered over the prior art in addressing the claims.

Claims 2, 4-9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17 are included because of their dependencies.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 2831

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen et al.

Chen et al discloses a printed circuit board (120, 140) having at least one protuberance (ground connection pin 130), a shield member (110) made of metal (col 3, line 16) having a substantially flat shape, an aperture (112).

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bianca et al.

Bianca et al discloses a printed circuit board (26) having at least one protuberance (10), a shield member (38) having a substantially flat shape, an aperture (24).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2, 4, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al

Art Unit: 2831

The teaching of Chen et al as discussed above does not disclose the protuberance having a spherical side surface, cross sections gradually reducing in area toward the vertex, or a circular cone. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the protuberance of Chen et al by employing the spherical side surface, the cross sections gradually reducing in area toward the vertex, or the circular cone, since more than a mere change of form is necessary for patentability. In re Span-Deck Inc. v. Fab-Con, Inc. (CA 8, 1982) 215 USPQ 835.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 06-23-03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues (1) that Bianca et al and Chen et al do not disclose an emi shielding system that includes an EMI shield member that has a substantially flat shape and that does not include sidewalls along its own perimeter. The examiner disagrees. With respect to (1) the shield members of Bianca and Chen et al are flat shaped and the limitation "an EMI shield member does not include sidewalls along its own perimeter" has been addressed in previous paragraphs.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung V. Ngo whose telephone number is (703) 308-7614. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 am to 06:00 pm.

Art Unit: 2831


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard, can be reached on (703) 308-3682.

The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9318 (Before Final) or (703) 872-9319 (After Final).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Hung V. Ngo

August 25, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Hung V. Ngo". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly stylized font.

**HUNG V. NGO
PRIMARY EXAMINER**